

## ***Minutes: Consolidated Billing Subcommittee Meeting***

**Thursday, September 28, 2000, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**Basement Conference Room - Hall of Fame Museum  
1101 West Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007**

	<b><i>Topic</i></b>	<b><i>Lead</i></b>	<b><i>Outcome</i></b>	<b><i>Att.</i></b>
1	Welcome, Intro, Sign-In	Shirley Renfroe	Shirley Renfroe (Pinnacle West) opened the meeting and welcomed members. Participants signed the attendance sheet and introduced themselves.	1
2	Review Minutes from Subcommittee Meeting (9/14/2000)	Shirley Renfroe	Minutes from the September 14, 2000 subcommittee meeting were reviewed by members.	
3	Updates from VEE and Metering Subcommittee Meetings	Stacy Smith Jack White	Stacy Smith (APS) and Jack White (SRP) updated Subcommittee members on the VEE and Metering Subcommittee meetings held on September 26 and 27, 2000.	
4	Discuss Possible Methods for Handling Questionable Bills that are Issued Between the Time that a Customer Goes DA and then Switches Back to Standard Offer or Chooses a Different MRSP or ESP	Shirley Renfroe	<p>Bill Rigsby (ACC) informed members that the ACC Electric Policy Group's definition of a final bill is the last bill that the customer receives from each of his or her service providers, and must be based on an actual meter read as opposed to an estimated meter read. Mr. Rigsby reiterated that an "interim bill," using estimated data, could be issued until an "actual final bill," based on an actual meter read, is generated to "true up" the final amount to be either collected from or refunded to a customer. In regard to the definition's impact on Issue No. 65, regarding calculated reads, the Electric Policy Group's position is that it has no effect on the one year trial since it is just that – a trial. Mr. Rigsby speculated that any decision regarding the final bill definition as it relates to Issue 65 would be considered after the one-year trial period is over. Members, including Mr. White (SRP) and Paul Taylor (RW Beck/Citizens), expressed concerns as to whether or not Commission Staff fully understood the problems and circumstances associated with this particular matter. Mr. Rigsby suggested that members raise the matter at upcoming policy meetings and prepare position papers that voice the members concerns. Darrel Pichoff (K.R. Saline &amp; Associates) stated his belief that Greg Patterson of the Residential Utility Consumer Office (RUCO) had insisted on actual reads for final bills at earlier electric restructuring meetings. Mr. Rigsby agreed to act on suggestions from Mr. White (SRP) and Gene Slechta (SRP) to see if minutes from past electric restructuring minutes contained any discussion on estimated vs. actual reads for final bills. Judy Taylor (TEP) presented a draft of a proposed waiver from the rules that prohibit first and final bills that are based on estimated reads (Attachment No. 2). Ms. Renfroe asked Ms. Smith to prepare a position paper for the next Consolidated Billing meeting and proposed that the draft of the proposed waiver, submitted by Ms. Taylor, be presented at the next Policy meeting scheduled for October 4, 2000. Members agreed to raise the matter at the October 4<sup>th</sup> meeting and request a discussion on it at the November 7, 2000, Policy Meeting. Members also believed that a representative from RUCO should attend the meeting.</p> <p>Cheryl Hieronimus (TEP) reported that Tucson Electric Power will use the UMI only.</p> <p>Scheduled Action Item: Janie Mollon (New West Energy) was unable to attend the meeting. Ms. Mollon was scheduled to report on the California rule on when data is due from the MRSP on a final bill and what the rebill rules are in that state.</p>	2

Action items for next meeting:

- Ms. Smith will prepare a position paper on estimated reads for final bills in light of the ACC Electric policy group's definition of a final bill.
- Mr. Rigsby will try to obtain copies of past discussions at electric restructuring meetings that may have related to estimated vs. actual reads on final bills.

5	Discuss Non-metered Accounts	Shirley Renfroe	Members are being asked to provide input at the next scheduled meeting.	
6	Review Definitions for Charge Codes To Be Used on the EDI 810	Shirley Renfroe	Members reviewed UIG (charge) codes and definitions that will be used on the EDI 810 (Attachment No. 3). Action items for next meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members are asked to review those charge codes with question marks and determine if they should be included on the EDI 810.</li> </ul>	3
7	Review Definitions for Charge Codes To Be Used on the EDI 810 and Continue Discussion and Finalization of the EDI 810 for ESP Consolidated Billing	Shirley Renfroe	Mr. Slechta presented an updated handout (Attachment No.'s 4 & 5) of changes to the Arizona Electric EDI Standards (810 (Invoice) for ESP Consolidated Billing Implementation Guide). Mr. Slechta explained each of the items of information that were updated based on member input at the September 14, 2000 meeting.	4 & 5
8	Items for Next Meeting (agenda)	Shirley Renfroe	The agenda for the October 12, 2000 meeting will be sent out with the meeting minutes. The location for the meeting will be as follows: Arizona Public Service – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, Conference Room 2 South, 400 North 5 <sup>th</sup> Street, Phoenix, AZ	
9	Suspend Meeting	Shirley Renfroe	The meeting was suspended at approximately 2:00 p.m.	
10	Announcement		C3 Communications is changing its name to Datapult.	

## Attachment No. 1 - Consolidated Billing Subcommittee

## ARIZONA PROCESS STANDARDIZATION WORKING GROUP

## Consolidated Billing Subcommittee

## July 20, 2000 Attendance List

[illegible]